United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit



APPELLANT'S PETITION FOR REHEARING

3-58

76-6104

United States Court of Appeals Court of For the Second Circuit

CHARLES BROWNSELL and CAZILIE BROWNSELL

Plaint ff s-Appe Cond CIRCU

28 197

-against-

Archie Davidson and Joan Boyd,

Defendants-Appellees.

PETITION FOR REHEARING

RICHARD W. ROSEN

Attorney for Plaintiffs-Appellants
Office & P.O. Address
120 North Main Street
New City, New York 10956
(914) 634-4464

United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

Docket No. 76-6104

CHARLES BROWNSELL and CAZILIE BROWNSELL,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

-against-

ARCHIE DAVIDSON and JOAN BOYD,

Defendants-Appellees.

PETITION FOR REHEARING

Appellants, pursuant to Rule 40 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, respectfully petition this Court, before the panel thereof which considered the proceeding herein, for a rehearing, and show as follows:

- 1. The order and decree on appeal from the order of the United States District Court, Southern District of New York, was received by Appellants' counsel on or about January 31, 1977.
- 2. The order of the Court, recalling the mandate issued herein, is dated March 16, 1977.
- 3. That the order of the court below was based upon a holding that the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and the jurisdiction of the National Labor Relations Board, taken together, constitute a pre-emption in such Act and in

such agency such as to oust the courts from entertaining the causes of action alleged in Appellants' complaint. The court cited as authority for its holding, San Diego Building Trades Council v. Garmon, 359 U.S. 236, 245 (1959).

4. Since this Court gave no rationale for its order and decree on appeal affirming the court below, it is assumed that this Court also relied on the San Diego case. It is the desire of the Appellants to call to the attention of this Court the case of Farmer v. United Brotherhood of Carpenters, Docket No. 75-804, which is presently before the United States Supreme Court, having been argued on November 8, 1976. It appears to the Appellants that the Farmer case raises issues common to the instant appeal as to the pre-emption issue. The argument of the Farmer case before the United States Supreme Court was subsequent to the filing and submission of the brief on behalf of the Appellants, and was, therefore, not mentioned in such brief. To the best of the knowledge and belief of counsel for the Appellants, although research has been done, the United States Supreme Court has not yet issued its decision in the Farmer case. In addition, counsel for the Appellants understands that the United States Supreme Court has recently granted certiorari and will hear an appeal from the courts of the State of California relative to a picketing situation, the issue being pre-emption to oust the jurisdiction of the courts and that the San Diego case will be up for reconsideration. As noted, the Farmer case is likely to be dispositive of the issue of pre-emption raised in the instant matter. Moreover, in view of the expected decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case from California, wherein it is likely that the San Diego case will be directly reconsidered, further dispositive matter on the pre-emption issue can be looked forward to from that Court. This Court is being asked by the Appellants to grant a rehearing and to decide the appeal herein based upon the *Farmer* case, which should issue shortly, along with the case from California.

Dated: New City, New York March 21, 1977

RICHARD W. ROSEN

Attorney for Plaintiffs-Appellants
Office & P.O. Address
120 North Main Street
New City, New York 10956
(914) 634-4464

To:

ROBERT B. FISKE, JR.

United States Attorney
Attorney for Defendants-Appellees
Office and P.O. Address
One St. Andrew's Plaza
New York, New York 10007
(212) 791-1978

Service of the Service of the Willing Person admitted this 28th day of Narch 1977

Frederick T. Davis By: In Ratherbuy, Seay